

## REMARKS

### **Power of Attorney/Correspondence Address Change**

The undersigned directs the Examiner's attention to the new power of attorney and change of correspondence address recently submitted in this case (copy attached). The Examiner is specifically requested to verify that these changes have been properly entered in the Office's systems so that any subsequent communications from the Office are directed to the correct address.

### **Allowed Claims**

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 14-15 and 29-30 are indicated as allowed. As such, these claims are not discussed further herein.

### **Claim Rejections Under §103**

The Examiner rejects independent claims 12-13, 17-27, 31-32 under §103 over Duffy in view of Howell. The Examiner also rejects claim 28 under §103 over Duffy in view of Howell and further in view of Keymer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.<sup>1</sup>

Applicants have amended claim 12 to read in relevant part "said second and third blade-engaging elements are commonly disposed on an arc of constant radius circumscribing said first blade-engaging element." This claim language is supported, *inter alia*, by the specification page 9, lines 10-16, reading "as indicated by the radial, phantom-line arrow 'R' in FIG. 1, the coplanar pins 26 extending from either the surfaces 22 or the surfaces 24 of the lobe 20 and the end piece 34 lie on a common arc, the center point of which is the pin 26 on the corresponding coplanar surface (22 or 24) of the coupling block 52. That arrangement ensures facile conversion between the two configurations of the saw...." Accordingly this amendment does not introduce new matter. Further, Applicants submit that this amendment relates to an issue squarely presented and argued earlier in the prosecution of this case, and is believed to eliminate an issue for appeal. Applicants therefore request that this amendment be entered.

In rejecting independent claim 12, the Examiner asserts that Duffy shows connection points 40a and 42a that are disposed on an arc circumscribing the first blade-engaging element 35. In doing so, the Examiner points to a dictionary definition of "arc," and then suggests that "any shaped curve" satisfies the claim limitation. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand "arc" as the Examiner proposes. However, in order to eliminate this issue and move this case forward to issuance, Applicants have amended claim 12 as indicated above to read in relevant part "said second and third blade-engaging elements are commonly disposed on an arc of constant radius circumscribing said first blade-engaging element." This language is believed to clarify a shape for the arc, consistent with the Examiner's discussion in the Action. As pointed out in the earlier responses, Duffy does not show or suggest this arrangement. Further, neither Howell nor Keymer cures this defect in Duffy, nor does the Examiner assert that they do. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Duffy and Howell fails to show each and every element

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this response, Applicant will assume *arguendo* that the Examiner has properly combined Duffy and Howell or Duffy, Howell, and Keymer, as is appropriate.

of independent claim 12. As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 12, and its dependent claims 12,16-28,31-32, all define patentable subject matter over the cited art.


**Action Clarification Needed**

If the Examiner does not allow the case, Applicants request clarification of two issues raised by the present Action:

1. The status of claims 19-20 and 29-30. The Summary of the Action indicates that claims 19-20 are allowed, but the text of the Action indicates that claims 19-20 are rejected. In addition, the Summary of the Action does not indicate the status of claims 29-30, but the text of the Action indicates that these claims are allowed. Clarification is therefore requested.
2. The paragraph numbered "3" of the text of the Action indicates that some unidentified claim is rejected under §103 over Duffy. In preparing this response, Applicants have assumed that this is a typographical error, and that the Examiner meant this paragraph to address the rejection of claim 16 under §103 over Duffy in view of Howell. However, clarification of the record is requested.

If any additional issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned so that the same may be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ted Paulding  
Registration No.: 19,294  
Tel: (860) 529-6766

Dated: May 16, 2005